

1/5/69
Harold Weisberg

Those I'd recommend would be determined by the number you want. I presume you cannot call all of them, so I limit my recommendation to four:

Perry, who is an attractive and personable young man, who also perjured himself. He told me that the bullet did cause lung damage and the rear non-fat^{ure}, from what the Bethesda doctors told him, was two inches down on the back. How persuasive he will be with his past ~~story~~ before the Commission I do not know. You have a memo on my interview, I think. He will testify with pride about the special kind of inconspicuous incision he made for the insertion of the tube. It was not the normal vertical slit such "experts" as Helpert assume. It was ~~across~~ the neck, bizarre twist that this is, for cosmetic reasons. Upon healing it is just like another fold in the skin and is invigible. "Healing? But that is the kind he made. He will testify to two calls from Bethesda. not the one Humes testified to, and that it would not have been a bit unusual for the Bethesda doctors to have called him at night rather than after they completed their autopsy examination, while they still had the body. If you use him and Kemp Clark both, you can wind up with a perjury and subornation of perjury business (the latter if you also use Humes)

McClelland, of course, because of his contemporaneous report giving

as the cause of death "gunshot wound to the left temple". Here I encourage you to forget all the crap Mark has been dishing out about what the Zapruder film shows, for it shows no such thing. What he says may make a sensation, but it just isn't true. There is abundant reason for believing there was a left-head wound, like I've already cited with Altgens. Read what I say about McClelland in WHITEWASH. Specter also did not produce him before the Commission. He didn't dare. The indications are McClelland would not back down on this. Specter never asked him about it! Instead he let the record stand. When asked if there was anything he'd said he'd want to change, McClelland said there was not. He would not back down. There is a young doctor who can corroborate him, if that is necessary, but he was then very junior. He was never a Commission witness. I found out about him by accident. I have him in POST MORTEM, McClelland, remember, was standing at the head and looking right down on it, the only doctor to do this.

Through these doctors, all except Perry being senior on the staff, I think you can do an additional thing that is inherent in some of my other memos, get a large number of pictures not in the Commission evidence in your evidence and public. I do not know, but I believe there must be Connally pictures. I know there are Oswald pictures. With Oswald, as I do in unpublished POST MORTEM, it is even possible to build a case for Jack Ruby not being the immediate cause of death. Hubert's deposition of Bieberdorff, the medical student who was the jail first-aid man, is a classic of untainted incompetence. He guaranteed Oswald would be dead by the "treatment". If you are interested, I will go into this with you. Briefly, the effect of Bieberdorff's "treatment" was to make it impossible for Oswald to talk- and he did, indeed, try.

I will do a separate memo on the autopsy doctors. However, I want to re-emphasize that if you take their testimony before the Warren Commission and do nothing but duplicate it in court, using Humes, Perry and Clark, you will have a perjury case and probably one of subornation. This, too, is in WHITEWASH, the chapter "The Doctors and the Autopsy". I sent both Humes and Boswell copies of WHITEWASH, solicited their comment, asked for interviews, and they were and have been publicly 100% silent.

Aside from Perry, who could not be avoided, the doctors who got the major attention before the Commission were Shew and Gregory. They did the major surgery on Connally. They never did say that 399 could have done what Specter attributed to it (again I refer you to that same chapter of WHITEWASH. But they will have to resist you because of the use made of them. They actually said 399 could not have had its imputed history. They were asked to conjecture about any bullet but that, could one bullet have caused these wounds, regardless of what this did to the bullet. Specter left that bit out. I think they will not be as amenable to constructive testimony as Shires, McClelland and Clark.

Returning to Price, if you have forgotten, he would testify that, when Tomlinson gave him the bullet from underneath the mattress, he, in turn, could not interest any federal agent in it. If there is a chance of possession from Tomlinson to the witness stand, it does not exist in the evidence or the Report. I publish the story of how the Secret Service in Washington learned about it and got it in WHITEWASH II. It was in an agent's pocket and he neglected to report having it! Note also that when each of the hospital employees involved was asked to prepare a statement, immediately, there is none printed (Price exhibits) for Tomlinson. So, all the original copies of all the original statements and all other records should be subpoenaed. Could Price testify to Tomlinson's, having been the one who provided them to the Commission? Tomlinson will be worried, ~~xxx~~ or be led to worry, about perjury.

Also, please bear in mind the car was washed at the hospital. Same chapter, also WHITEWASH II. Tom Wicker, NYTimes Washington Bureau Chief, still has his original note of seeing a bucket of bloody water by the car.